DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 216 TM 009 740

AUTHOR Merkel-Keller, Claudia; Herr, Audrey
TITLE Multi-Dimensional Planning/Evaluation Schema for Community Education.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (63rd, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education Programs; *Community Education; Community Involvement; *Community Programs; *Conceptual Schemes; *Evaluation Methods; Input Output Analysis; Participant Satisfaction; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Context Input Process Product Evaluation Model; *Lakewood Community Schools NJ; New Jersey (Lakewood)

ABSTRACT

A model for planning and evaluating community education programs--Stufflebeam's context, input, process, product (CIPP) evaluation model--was described and field-tested with the community education programs in Lakewood, New Jersey. Community education was defined as a concern for everything that affects the well-being of all citizens within a community, and encompassing: (1) school involvement; (2) community served; (3) public facility as a community center; (4) scope of activities and services; (5) community needs; (6) community resources and interagency cooperation; (7) program clients; and (8) community participation. Lakewood's programs were supported by federal legislation, by New Jersey's thorough and efficient law, and by foundation funding. Particular emphasis was placed on the elderly and minority group residents of Lakewood. Evaluation data were obtained from participant interviews, staff questionnaires, participant questionnaire, neighborhood awareness questionnaire, and annual program reports from 1966-1978. The program's growth was demonstrated by the increase in projects (from 67 to 282) and in enrolled participants (from 1,853 to 61,432) between 1966 and 1978. (Several questionnaires are appended). (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177216

TM009 740

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MULTI-DIMENSIONAL PLANNING/EVALUATION SCHEMA FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Claudia MerKel-Keller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Claudia Merkel-Keller
and
Audrey Herr
New Jersey State Department of Education

Paper presented at AERA Annual Conference
San Francisco, California
April 1979

Introduction

Today, more than ever before, there is an awareness that education is a continuous, lifelong process that should be responsive to the needs of the community. Increasingly, educators and local citizenry are expressing the belief that the public school should provide programs that extend beyond the scope of traditional educational systems. The community education process addresses these concerns by: involving the public in the local educational decision making process; achieving greater interagency cooperation in the planning and delivery of services; maximizing the utilization of physical, financial, and human resources; and improving and expanding programming for all age groups.

In the late 1960's, several districts in New Jersey recognizing the unique features and potential of the community education concept, initiated their own community schools. During the past few years, a more concerted effort has been made toward statewide adoption of the community education philosophy.

With passage of the Public Education Act of 1975 in New Jersey (N.J.S.A. 18A:7-1 et. seq.), the Legislature provided for a "thorough and efficient" (T & E) planning process that is responsive to the needs of children, parents, the community and the state. As a process for school improvement, T & E recognizes that public awareness and public involvement in the education process are critical

and therefore, mandates that opportunity be provided by local districts for maximum citizen involvement.

The core of T & E is embedded in a systematic planning process calling for the development of educational goals; the determination of educational needs based on the goal statements; implementation of program improvement steps based on identified needs; and program/budget evaluation. New Jersey is unique in terms of implementing this overarching reform law by virtue of the fact that local autonomy is protected since the local districts set their own goals, objectives and standards for improvement under the accountability umbrella provided by the state.

The other critical facet, obviously, of the T & E process is the involvement and participation of the community in the determination of the educational mission and educational priorities set for the school system.

These legislative factors in New Jersey, coupled with economic factors for more complete facilities utilization by community members, spearheaded a strong thrust toward the community education concept in the past few years.

Additional impetus for community education programs stem from the federal level in terms of the Community School Act (P.L. 93-380, section 405 of 1974), and from New Jersey's own intra-agency push launched by the Governor's task force (1978). These elements, in conjunction with Mott Foundation seed money and support, have provided an initial baseline for the development and refinement of community education

programs in the state.

Definition

It is useful at this point to provide a definition of community education since the term is sometimes used synonymously with that of community school. The difference between the two terms is that community education is the overall philosophy, whereas the community school is the physical facility through which the services are delivered. Community education should be viewed as a process and a product that is concerned with everything that affects the well-being of all citizens within a given community. This definition extends the role of education from the traditional concept of teaching children, to that of identifying the wants, needs, and problems of the total community. Conceptually, one can identify eight minimum elements of a community education program process to encompass the following:

1. School Involvement: The program/process must provide for the direct and substantial involvement of a public elementary or secondary school in the administration and operation of the program.

2. Community Served: The program/process must serve an identified community which should be coextensive with the school attendance area.

3. Public Facility as a Community Center: Program/process services to the community must be sufficiently concentrated and comprehensive in a specific public facility, including, but not limited to, a public elementary or secondary school, a public community or junior college, or a community recreation or park center, in terms of scope and nature of program services.

4. Scope of Activities and Services: The program/process must extend the program activities and services offered by, and uses made of, the public facility in terms of the scope and nature of program services, the target population served, and the hours of service.

5. Community Needs: The program/process must include systematic and effective procedures for identifying and documenting on a continuing basis the needs, interests, and concerns of the community.

6. Community Resources and Interagency Cooperative Arrangements: The program/process must provide for the identification and utilization to the fullest extent possible of the educational, cultural, recreational, and other existing and planned resources located outside of the school.

7. Program Clients: The program/process must be designed to serve all age groups in the community.

8. Community Participation: The program/process must provide for the active and continuous involvement, on an advisory basis, of institutions, groups and individuals in the planning and carrying out of the program, including involvements in the assessment of community need and resources and program evaluation.

Rationale for Study

New Jersey, through a variety of funding sources (HEW, OE, and the Mott Foundation), has initiated a series of programmatic and process responses to the need for community education, and in cases where community education programs already exist, has called for an expansion of these programs. All of these initiatives require a somewhat non-traditional evaluation approach.

It is the emphasis of this study--

1. to present and apply a conceptual model for the planning/evaluation of community education programs;

2. to report the field-test findings on the utility of the planning/evaluation model as a paradigm for the evaluation of generic community education programs.

Given the multi-faceted aspects of community education, an evaluation schema, sensitive to the various components

of the community school process, was developed which would serve program managers both in terms of a planning mechanism and an evaluation tool.

The Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) evaluation model represented in Figure 1 is based on the work of Daniel Stufflebeam (1971) and is intended to apply to any community education programmatic or process schema. Figure 2 delineates the criteria which community education programs in New Jersey must satisfy to be in accord with the intent of the state's T & E legislation and with the philosophy and concepts of a community education program.

Consequently, the decision was made to look at an already existing program since a program in its initial planning stage would not have enabled the application of the entire model. To field-test the useability of this approach (i.e., field-test the model), a site was selected in New Jersey which had had an ongoing community school program for a number of years. Upon the recommendation of the SEA Community Education Project Director, Lakewood was identified as the most viable site for this pilot study. The Lakewood program had been ongoing since 1966 when a community task force spear-headed development of the program in Lakewood after they had returned from an exploratory visit to the Flint, Michigan exemplary program.

The model, described above, was utilized to retro-spectively analyze the Lakewood Community School Program.

FRAMEWORK FOR PLANNING EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROJECTS[1]

FIGURE 1

	CONTEXT	INPUT	PROCESS	PRODUCT
OBJECTIVE	1. Define relevant environment. 2. Describe desired and actual conditions. 3. Identify unmet needs and unused opportunities. 4. Diagnose problems preventing need satisfaction and utilization of opportunities (diagnosing problems provides essential bases for developing objectives which will lead to program improvement).	1. To provide information to determine how to utilize resources to attain project objectives: A. Identify and assess 1) relevant agency capabilities; 2) strategies for achieving objectives; 3) designs for strategy implementation. B. Review alternative designs of 1) resource, time and budget requirements; 2) potential procedural barriers; 3) consequence and costs of overcoming; 4) relevance of design and project objectives.	1. To provide periodic feedback to responsible people. 2. To detect or predict defects in implementation. 3. To provide information for programmatic decisions. 4. To maintain a record of procedures.	To measure and interpret attainments during and at conclusion of project
METHOD	1. A conceptual analysis to identify and define the limits of the domain to be served and its major sub-parts. 2. Empirical study to identify unmet needs and unused opportunities (i.e., survey of local adult population re unmet needs, etc.). 3. Combine empirical and conceptual analyses with theory and authoritative opinion toward problem solution.	1. Committee deliberations. 2. Search of related project objectives. 3. Employ consultants. 4. Pilot experimental projects.	Four essential features: 1. Provision for full-time process evaluator. 2. Instruments for describing the process. 3. Regular feedback meetings between process evaluator and project staff. 4. Frequent updating of process evaluation design.	1. Devise operational definitions of objectives. 2. Measuring criteria associated with activity objectives. 3. Comparison of these measurements with predetermined standards. 4. Make rational interpretations of outcomes using recorded context input and process info
RELATION TO DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHANGE PROCESS	Specifics: 1. The setting to be served. 2. Goals to be sought. 3. Objectives to be achieved.	Provides information for determining: 1. if outside assistance necessary to achieve objectives; 2. strategy to be used new or available solutions; 3. procedural design for implementing selected strategy.	Provides information for anticipating and overcoming procedural problems for making preprogrammed decisions for for interpreting project outcomes.	In change process, products evaluation provides information for deciding to continue, terminate, modify or refocus an activity.

[1]This model was developed by D. Stufflebeam.

FIGURE 2

MUST CRITERIA FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS
IN NEW JERSEY

CRITERIA I	CRITERIA II	CRITERIA III
Elements of T&E	Elements of Community Education	Evaluation Model
• goal development	• school involvement	• Context evaluation
• needs identification	• community served	1. objective 2. method 3. relation to decision making in the change process
• program/budget selection	• public facility as a community center	
• implementation cycle	• scope of activities and services	• Input evaluation
• program/budget evaluation	• community needs	1. objective 2. method 3. relation to decision making in the change process
Discussion	• community resources and interagency cooperative arrangements	• Process evaluation
The program satisfied legislative intent of T & E mandates.	• program	1. objective 2. method 3. relation to decision making in the change process
	• community participation	• Product evaluation
	Discussion	1. objective 2. method 3. relation to decision making in the change process
	The program satisfied philosophy and concepts of community education programs.	• Impact evaluation
		1. awareness 2. involvement 3. commitment 4. action 5. internalization

In essence, this study allowed the exploration, development and refinement of a multi-dimensional planning/evaluation schema which not only fulfilled New Jersey state statutes, but also responded to federal mandates, as well as, having applicability for other types of educational programs.

Methodology

After components of the model were determined, and Lakewood was selected as the site for field-testing the multi-dimensional planning/evaluation schema for community education, an evaluation plan was developed for conducting the study. It was intended that the model would provide a "must criteria" framework in which a retrospective analysis of the process would be conducted.

Data were obtained from a variety of sources.

A. Interviews

An interview protocal was developed which elicited information regarding the key elements in the program. (See Appendix.) A series of 20 interviews were conducted in Lakewood, by the authors, with people involved with the program. Ten of these people (50%) were involved in initiating the effort, in fact, five of them were part of the original group that went to Flint, Michigan to learn about community education in 1966. Of the total group interviewed, 16 (80%) are still actively involved with the Community School in a variety of ways, i.e., Member of Community School Board; Assistant Superintendent, Board of Education; Township Business Manager; Coordinator, Adult Hispanic Program; Director, NAACP Lakewood Chapter. A 20-item Likert type rating scale, Impressions of the Community School (ICS) (Wood and Santellanes, 1971) was completed by each of the people after the interview. The ICS elicited responses to general questions, impressions, and/or opinions regarding the Lakewood Community Education program.

B. Staff Evaluation Questionnaire

A staff evaluation questionnaire (Wood and Santellanes, 1977), consisting of seven open-ended questions regarding program effectiveness (see Appendix) was administered to 13 staff

members. The ICS was completed by all staff respondents.

C. Participant Questionnaire

A questionnaire (Wood and Santellanes, 1971) eliciting information both descriptive and qualitative regarding the program, was designed for program participants. (See Appendix.) A total of 117 questionnaires and ICS forms were mailed to community members. Of the 117 forms, 12 were returned because they were undeliverable, and hence, only 102 of the questionnaires reached their destination. A total of 41 people responded to the mail survey, yielding a response rate of 40%.

Another 37 participant questionnaires and ICS forms were administered by the authors to community members on-site in their evening classes.

Of the total 85 participant responses obtained (41 mailed and 45 administered) only 72 ICS forms were used for data analysis. Thirteen participants (6 mailed and 7 administered) who completed the questionnaires, did not react at all to the ICS, and consequently, were not included in the analysis.

D. Neighborhood Awareness Questionnaire

A neighborhood awareness questionnaire (Wood and Santellanes, 1971) eliciting general awareness knowledge from the respondent regarding the Lakewood Community School, was administered by a research assistant, working with the authors, to 34 community members. (See Appendix.) This was accomplished by the research assistant stationing herself in strategic spots in the community (post office, supermarket, bank, and two minority community program offices), to allow for polling a cross-section of the community.

E. Other Data Sources

The other sources of information were the Annual Reports of the program from 1966-1978. Analysis of these data provided some indications of longitudinal changes in the dynamics, enrollments, and offerings of the program. The Summer Recreational Program Annual Reports were also examined for similar elements, as it serves as an extension of the Community School during the summer and has the same director.

APPLICATION OF THE CIPP MODEL

The CIPP model was applied to an historical reconstruction of the existing variables at the time the program was initiated. In the following section, each aspect of the model is discussed and the component elements are traced to their current status. This methodology provided a vehicle for examining the viability of the model for other community education programs. Specifically, if each of these component parts are functional, they should have potential for program planning and improvement.

I. Context Evaluation

The Relevant Environment: Background Information

Lakewood has a unique history. The town is located in a part of New Jersey that enjoys a more moderate climate than surrounding areas within a radius of 200 miles. This led to the development of a resort community featuring numerous hotels which catered to multitudes of guests and visitors. This was the main industry for 40 years. However, in the 1960's, air travel made it possible for people to vacation in warmer, more exotic places. One by one, the large hotels started closing and no other employment was readily available for the large numbers of minority group members who had worked in the hotels. There had been a small chicken farm industry, but that, too, declined with the hotels.

Additionally, Ocean County has very liberal social welfare benefits which were, and still are, very attractive to

immigrants and others seeking to relocate. Consequently, there was an influx of minorities to Ocean County who sought to avail themselves of the public assistance provided until they obtained employment. They settled in the already established minority communities, thereby, substantially increasing the numbers of minority group people in Lakewood.

Concommitantly, many elderly people had also moved to Lakewood's retirement communities. They liked the special features of the climate and were already familiar with Lakewood from its hotel and resort era.

Thus, the mid-1960's witnessed considerable growth in two segments of the population, the elderly and the minorities. Neither group was enthusiastic about local education: the elderly felt they were paying taxes and not getting a return; the minorities felt that the schools were not meeting their needs. Hence, there was little support for the school budget. Also, the Black community was responding to the militancy of that period by lashing out at the community however they could. They were discontent and agitated. One of the problems was that youth had no place to which they could go for constructive and/or recreational activities.

The "town fathers" were concerned. In a total population of approximately 18,000, 35% were minority group members (with a small number of Hispanics), and 15% were senior citizens. It was at this time that the President of the Lakewood Board of Education first learned of the community education program in Flint, Michigan. He convinced the Township Manager that it

held promise for Lakewood, and the two of them went to Flint for a three-day seminar. That visit was the first of the six site visits by various members of the Lakewood community. They all returned from Flint encouraged and hopeful, believing that they had discovered a means of solving some of their social and financial problems, which could potentially benefit the entire community.

The School Board was persuaded to provide funds and facilities for the program to get underway. A seven member Community School Board was formed which included members of the School Board and Township Committee. They selected a director who had experience in the Flint Community Education Program to plan and initiate the program as of July 1, 1966.

A community needs assessment was conducted in August 1966. All Lakewood residents were sent a questionnaire which described the community school, its purpose, and requested feedback regarding the kinds of adult enrichment and recreational activities in which they were interested. The 300 responses provided the initial data base for making programmatic decisions. By the conclusion of the first year, the program was expanded to encompass several other areas as needs were voiced and identified within the community.

Implicit to the development of the program were the goals and objectives embodying the elements of community education which also address the "thorough and efficient" legislative

mandates. Although not formally stated as such, the broad goals were:

1. to have greater utilization of the township's principle capital investment, the schools;
2. to develop a community education program which would meet the needs of all segments of the population within the community;
3. to improve relations and communication within the community.

Specific objectives toward the attainment of the above goals were:

1. to determine the unmet needs and interests of community residents;
2. to develop courses and/or activities which reflect unmet needs and interests of all segments of the community;
3. to increase interagency cooperation;
4. to publicize the program among all segments of the community;
5. to recruit participants from all segments of the community;
6. to establish procedures for continuous community input and feedback.

While the goals and objectives have remained almost the same over the years, the population has more than doubled to a total of 38,000. Half of the present residents are members of minority groups with the Hispanic people reaching a figure of 5,000. The elderly now comprise 30% (11,400).

II. INPUT EVALUATION

This section focused on the utilization of resources toward attainment of objectives.

During the period preceding initiation of the program, members of the Board of Education and Township Committee agreed on a joint funding policy that would provide the

community education program with a starting budget of $15,000 for the first year. Oter resources available to the program were the township's six schools and all township recreational facilities.

The program was administered by the Lakewood Community School Administrative Board which consisted of two members from the Township Committee, one member who was a township administrator, and one member of the Township Park and Recreation Advisory Board. The purpose of this board was (1) to act as a liaison organization, (2) to implement the Community School Program on behalf of the Township and Board of Education in accordance with the rules and policies of the Township and the Board of Education, and (3) to include the following duties and responsibilities:

a. Prepare the budget for the program subject to the approval of the Township and the Board of Education.

b. Hire personnel:

   (1) Community School Director and other coordinators as needed;

   (2) Instructors;

   (3) Determine pay scale for coordinator and instructors.

c. Approve program set up by the Community School Director.

d. Hold regular monthly meetings with special meetings as necessary.

e. Cooperate with the Advisory Committee in studying needs/wishes of the community in order to suggest possible activities, programs, and courses to the Community School Director.

f. Insure that an adequate program of public relations be carried on by the Community School Director with the cooperation of the Advisory Committee.

g. Outline financial procedures for the Community School Program with the aid and advice of the Township and the Board of Education auditor.

Two advisory committees were established to aid in developing program ideas and as a communications link between the Community School Program and the people of the community.

1. The Community School Advisory Committee was set-up after a trip to Flint and was organized through the Community School Program. Those who attended the national community school clinic in Flint, Michigan, felt, on their return, that they could serve in an advisory capacity to the Community School Program. Members include two members of the Board of Education, one member of the Township Committee, the general manager of school cafeterias, the Business Administrator of the School Board, Lakewood High School Assistant Principal, three elementary school principals, a representative of the Township Park and Recreation Advisory Board, and a juvenile officer.

2. The Clarke Community School Advisory Council was made up of the school principal, president of the P.T.A., and parents from the Clarke School area. The general purpose of this committee was to advise the Community School Program on the neighborhood needs and to provide suggestions as to the types of activities and programs which will best meet the needs of the Clarke School area.

A project director was hired who had experience with the community education program in Flint, Michigan, in addition to Mott Foundation training. A "pragmatic" strategy was then adapted for "getting the program off the ground." The component elements were:

a. Development of a curriculum based on the expressed and perceived needs of all segments of the community.

b. Selection of school sites for various offerings to facilitate maximum enrollment and attendance.

c. Publicity campaign which included the mass-media (flyers, posters, newspaper articles and advertisements, radio) and public speakers going to community group meetings to describe program, i.e., churches, Elks, Jaycees, N.A.A.C.P., etc.

d. Supervision of program implementation by Director.

e. The establishment of a continuous formal and informal feedback system to keep in touch with the changing needs of the community, i.e , School Advisory Council.

The program's budget has expanded considerably from its initial $15,000 in 1966. In 1979, the total program budget was $300,000. These monies came from different sources: the Board of Education and Township still have an equal funding policy with each contributing $48,000, for a total of $96,000; there was a $37,400 balance from the previous year's budget; the SEA contributes $12,000 toward the Director's salary; and $157,000 comes from various funded programs, i.e., Adult Basic Education, WIN, and High School Equivalency. Much of the annual carry-over budget is raised by the minimal fees charged for some of the courses in the Adult Recreation Program. In addition, non-residents must pay a two dollar registration fee per class. The Summer Recreation Program has a separate budget of $119,000 which is obtained from Township funds.

In 1979, the facilities available to the program included all six school buildings, all township recreational facilities, YMCA, YWCA, many churches, senior citizen facilities and all municipal facilities, including the recently remodeled Community Center.

III. Process Evaluation

While the program never had an evaluator, as such, modifications were made in the program's structure, content and administration in response to problems experienced during

the initial implementation stages. The function of providing feedback to "the responsible people" was mainly the task of the Community School Administrative Board. However, the monthly meetings were so poorly attended that often the required quorum for a meeting were not available. Therefore, individual members would visit program activities when they had to report to their respective groups, i.e., at budget time or when problems were encountered. During the 1968 school year, the Board was reorganized to include only one member each from the Board of Education and the Township Manager and the Board of Education Business Manager.

The Board functions were to approve the budget, to draw up a resolution as to the philosophy and administration of the Community School Program, and to hire a new Community School Director.

The final and present reorganization occurred in 1972 with the adoption of a joint resolution by the Board of Education and the Township Committee which established the existing Community School Committee (CSC) consisting of: two (2) members of the Township Committee (selected annually by the Mayor); two (2) members of the Board of Education (selected annually by the President of the Board of Education); and three (3) members from the public at large (appointed annually by a majority vote of the four (4) appointed members of the CSC). Their responsibilities include: the establishment of program(s) and policy formulation; the hiring of employees; budget preparation; submission of a minimum of

quarter annual reports to the Board of Education and Township Committee.

Overall, there was no set procedure for process evaluation. The Director had the responsibility for writing an annual report at the end of each school year. Participants were encouraged to voice their concerns to the Director at any time. They also completed an end-of-semester evaluation regarding the effectiveness of various aspects of the completed course and indicated any recommendations and/or requests for other courses. These requests were generally honored by the next semester if sufficient participants were available.

IV. PRODUCT

This section presents the findings of the various data collection procedures utilized as part of this evaluation study conducted during the 1978-79 school year, which was the thirteenth year of program implementation.

Program Offerings and Enrollments

Table I was constructed by examining the Annual Reports of the program from its inception (school year 1966-67) to the last school year (1977-78). The growth of the program offerings from 67 projects in 1966-67 to 282 projects in 1977-78, reflects the extent to which efforts were made to respond to the needs and interests of the community. The total annual enrollment multiplied from 1,853 participants in its initial year to 61,432 in the last year. Even when considering that the Township's population increased from

18,000 in 1966 to 38,000 in 1978, there was a significantly greater proportion of residents (and possibly non-residents) engaged in the activities in 1978 (154%[a] than in 1966 (10%). The range of activities offered during the last year addressed a wide variety of needs and interests, from auto mechanics, bread baking, and stable cleaning, to High School Equivalency Examination Preparation for both the English and Spanish Speaking and College level Extension Program courses.

[a]Some residents enrolled more than one time.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OFFERED AND PARTICIPANT ENROLLMENT FOR THE LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM, FROM 1966-67 TO 1978-79

YEAR	NUMBER	AND TYPE OF PROJECT	ENROLLMENT	
1966-67	58	Adult Enrichment	722	
	3	High School Equivalency	48	
	6	Recreational	80	
Totals	67			1,853
1968-69	68	Adult Enrichment	1,111	
	7	High School Equivalency	150	
	6	Recreational	360	
	9	Senior Citizens	145	
	5	Student Enrichment	173	
Totals	95			1,939
1969-70	66	Adult Enrichment	967	
	8	High School Equivalency (English/Spanish)	146	
	47	Student Enrichment	981	
	16	Senior Citizen	182	
	4	Recreation	152	
Totals	141			2,428
1970-71	50	Adult Enrichment	718	
	9	Adult Basic Education	168	
	6	High School Equivalency	179	
	11	Student Enrichment	422	
	2	Senior Citizen	54	
	1	Recreation	50	
Totals	79			1,591
1971-72	58	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	866	
	9	Adult Basic Education	215	
	6	High School Equivalency	239	
	26	Student Enrichment	1,103	
	11	Senior Citizens	208	
Totals	110			2,631
1972-73	>200[a]	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	>2,000[a]	
	8	Adult Basic Education	198	
	>6	High School Equivalency (English & Spanish)	214	
	4	Accredited Evening H.S.	30	
	6[a]	Senior Citizens	>200[a]	
	39	Student Enrichment	2,545	
Totals	>263[a]			>5,187

[a]The Annual Report for 1972-73 reported these figures as more than the numerals indicated.

TABLE 1 (continued)

YEAR		NUMBER	AND TYPE OF PROJECT	ENROLLMENT	
1973-74		60	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	2,375	
		10	Adult Basic Education	244	
		6	High School Equivalency (English & Spanish)	150	
		4	Accredited Evening H.S.	22	
		4	Naturalization (ESL & Citizenship)	123	
		61	Special Programs	15,578	
		25	Senior Citizen Program	6,589	
		56	Student Enrichment	9,627	
	Totals	226			34,708
1974-75		92	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	3,241	
		10	Adult Basic Education	228	
		6	High School Equivalency	295	
		4	Accredited Evening H.S.	25	
		6	Naturalization	268	
		62	Student Enrichment	2,726	
		34	Senior Citizen Program	13,229	
		73	Special Programs	37,791	
	Totals	287			57,803
1975-76		104	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	4,618	
		10	Adult Basic Education	232	
		6	High School Equivalency (English & Spanish)	303	
		4	Accredited Evening H.S.	26	
		4	Naturalization	188	
		51	Student Enrichment	3,506	
		27	Senior Citizens	NA[b]	
		73	Special Programs	NA[b]	
	Totals	279			>8,873[c]
1976-77		107	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	5,073	
		10	Adult Basic Education	161	
		6	High School Equivalency (English & Spanish)	395	
		4	Accredited Evening H.S.	20	
		4	Naturalization	253	
		50	Student Enrichment	3,754	
		>21	Senior Citizens	NA[b]	
		50	Special Programs	NA[b]	
	Totals	>252			>9,656[c]

[b]Enrollment figures were not available.

[c]This total is incomplete as figures were not available for two major programs.

TABLE 1 (continued)

YEAR	NUMBER	AND TYPE OF PROJECT	ENROLLMENT	
1977-78	103	Adult Enrichment & Recreation	5,873	
	10	Adult Basic Education	186	
	6	High School Equivalency (English & Spanish)	299	
	4	Accredited Evening H.S.	16	
	2	Naturalization	44	
	85	Student Enrichment	8,753	
	17	Senior Citizens	11,462	
	55	Special Programs	34,794	
Totals	282			61,432

Data for the Summer Recreation Program (SRP) were obtained from the Annual Reports. While the SRP has a separate budget, it is regarded as the summer extension of the Community School, as it has the same director, and services the same community. Table 2 clearly indicates the broad outreach of the SRP to a total of 147,306 contacts with participants in eight playgrounds with 17 different activities. The range of activities offered over the years is displayed in Table 3 and spans from Arts and Crafts to Women's Softball League, both of which have been offered every summer since 1967.

Impact of the Program

Comparative data were obtained for the ICS which asked the reader to indicate the extent to which they agreed with 20 positive statements related to the goals, objectives and activities of the community education program. The ratings of twelve of these statements dealing with impact of the program are included in Table 4. The three respondent groups were: (1) twenty community residents, all of whom were currently, or at some time in the past, actively involved with the administration and/or management of the program; (2) the 13 staff members in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) program component who were at the school the evening the authors were on-site; and (3) 72 participant responses (37 students in the ABE programs who completed the ICS during the on-site visit, and 35 participants who returned the mailed ICS).

TABLE 2.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES, SITES AND PARTICIPANTS FOR THE LAKEWOOD SUMMER RECREATION PROGRAM FROM 1966-67 TO 1977-78

YEAR	NO. OF PLAYGROUNDS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TOTAL VISITATIONS[a] FOR ENTIRE PROGRAM
1966	3	6	12,320[b]
1967	4	13	68,212
1968	6	14	70,514
1969	3	9	77,630
1970	4	8	75,380
1971	6	13	104,981
1972	6	14	120,225
1973	6	15	114,570
1974	7	18	133,091
1975	8	19	156,880
1976	7	17	161,592
1977	8	17	158,375
1978	8	17	147,306

[a]Total number of contacts with participants.
[b]Not including beach visitations

TABLE 3.

SUMMARY OF LAKEWOOD SUMMER RECREATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES FROM 1966 TO 1978

ACTIVITY	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Arts and Crafts		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Basketball Clinic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Basketball League	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ed Carleton Baseball League									x	x	x	x	x
Creative Dramatics												x	x
Day Camp		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Field Trips/Transportation		x	x					x	x	x	x	x	x
Football Clinic									x		x		
Junior Baseball								x	x	x	x		
Men's Softball	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Movies		x	x										
Music		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Pee Wee Baseball					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Physical Fitness	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Playgrounds	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Princeton Teen Avenue Center						x	x	x	x	x	x		
Puppetry		x											
Soccer		x											
Special Activities						x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Summer Olympics		x	x										
Swimming/Waterfront	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Tennis Instruction			x							x	x	x	x
Tennis Program			x						x	x	x	x	x
Women's Softball League	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS ON ITEMS RELATED TO IMPACT OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL BY GROUP, IN PROPORTIONS

ITEMS	PARTICIPANT (N=72[a])				STAFF (N=13)				COMMUNITY RESIDENT (N=20)			
	Positive	Undecided	Negative	Does Not Apply[b]	Positive	Undecided	Negative	Does Not Apply	Positive	Undecided	Negative	Does Not Apply
1. I have met the community school coordinator and feel comfortable talking with him/her.	87	4	3	6	100	-	-	-	95	-	-	5
2. I have made new friends in optional[c] program activities.	85	3	5	7	84	8	-	8	75	-	-	25
3. A list of optional program activities is provided for community residents.	80	8	4	8	100	-	-	-	95	-	-	5
4. I feel more comfortable going to the school since the initiation of the optional program.	78	10	2	10	54	23	-	23	65	-	5	30
5. The types of optional program activities offered reflect the problems and needs of the community.	72	13	5	10	77	8	-	13	95	-	-	5
6. My impression of the school has improved as a result of the optional program.	68	18	4	10	77	15	-	8	90	5	-	5
7. The optional program has helped our community in ways other than programs.*	68	17	4	10	62	15	-	23	95	-	-	5
8. There is better communication between the school and community as a result of the optional program.*	66	22	6	6	92	8	-	-	95	-	-	5
9. The community is involved in planning special events offered in the school.*	66	19	1	14	92	8	-	-	90	-	-	5
10. The community school coordinator listens to suggestions from people in the community.**	57	15	3	15	92	-	-	8	95	-	-	5
11. Some community problems are being addressed through optional program activities.**	54	21	7	18	77	8	-	15	95	-	-	5
12. Community residents assist in determining the activities offered in the optional program.**	52	32	5	11	77	8	-	15	95	-	-	5

[a]Of the 85 participants who responded to the questionnaire, 72 also responded to the Rating Scale.

[b]This response category also includes no response, and/or, did't understand statement.

[c]Optional program refers to activities offered by the Community School.

*Significant difference between positive ratings at p. .05 level.

**Significant difference between positive ratings at p. .01 level.

In looking at these data, two facts were immediately apparent. First, was the strong positive impact of the program as demonstrated by more than half (52%) of all respondents, regardless of group, assigning positive ratings to each of the program components represented by the statements. This finding is accentuated by looking at the proportions of respondents who selected the negative ratings. The other choices, "Undecided," and "Does Not Apply," mostly reflect a lack of familiarity with the content of the statement. Secondly, for half of the items (Numbers 7-12), significantly[1] larger proportions of the community residents and/or staff selected positive ratings than did the participants. This is understandable when the relation of each of these groups to the program is considered. Many of these community residents were responsible for initiating and nurturing the community school. Likewise, staff motivation predisposed them to view the program very favorably. (It should be noted here that several members of both these groups had indicated perceived program weaknesses and suggestions for improvement in response to the open-ended questionnaire. Those findings were reported elsewhere in this report.)

The participant ratings attest to the positive effects the program has had on their lives. They have met and feel comfortable with the top person in the program (87%), have made new friends (85%), and feel more comfortable in the school (78%). Not only do they believe that the Community

[1]Chi square test revealed significant differences between the positive ratings for items 7-12.

School Program can help the community (68%), but that the community has an influence on the program insofar as the activities reflect the needs of the community (72%), the improvement of communication between school and community (66%), and community involvement in suggesting (57%) and planning activities (52%).

It is obvious that the Lakewood Community School has been successful in varying degrees in meeting their goals. The first goal for dealing with greater utilization of the Township's schools has been largely satisfied. Nevertheless, there were some indications that all neighborhood schools should have program offerings to overcome the lack of public transportation.

By looking at the number of people who participated in the activities (Table 1), it is obvious that the program responded to the needs and interests of the community which was the intent of the second goal. The only area where an unmet need was indicated, was in the provision of local vocational training programs. The existence of such programs in neighboring towns does not seem to be of any consequence, as the Lakewood minorities in need of occupational skills do not attend those schools. The reasons cited were mainly no means of transportation and feeling uncomfortable and out-of-place in those communities.

The third goal addressed the improvement of community relations and communication. The opinions of the people interviewed, which included representatives of the Black and

Hispanic groups, were favorable. Also, there have not been any serious conflicts or demonstrations by minority groups in recent years. This may be, in part, attributable to the program and/or partially due to the fact that the "times" have changed. Some references were made to the fact that people from all segments of the community were working side-by-side in many courses, such as in the woodworking class. These types of contacts are generally beneficial in improving community relations and inter-group understanding.

The objective which still requires concentrated effort, according to the data, is in recruiting more minority group residents into the program. A relevent comment made by an interviewee was that if the program offered activities in which they were interested, i.e., vocational areas, there would be greater participation by the "hard core minority unemployed." This may be the case as 91% of the neighborhood people surveyed were aware of the program already. While the sampling of 34, for local residents who completed the Neighborhood Awareness Questionnaire may not be representative of the entire community, one would assume there was a general familiarity with the program throughout all segments of the population.

Conclusion

The major purposes of this paper were to (1) field-test the CIPP planning/evaluation model, and (2) to look at the community education program in Lakewood. While the Lakewood Community School was not in the planning stage suggested by

the model, there was a definite advantage to superimposing the various component parts on the existing program. It provided a structure and logic to the programmatic considerations which would be of great benefit to a new planned and/or initiated community education program. The built-in evaluation features would provide necessary feedback and could ameliorate organizational problems and assist in future planning. As for the Lakewood Community School Program which embodies the eight community education elements, as well as, the T & E components, the evidence has proven that it is an effective program in that it has satisfied the "must criteria," as well as the goals which constituted the underlying constructs of the program.

At present, there are eleven districts in New Jersey with seed money from the Mott Foundation, who are planning community education programs. All of them are utilizing this model. We anticipate that we will have even more evidence as to the utility of the CIPP system to community education in the next few years.

References

Report of the New Jersey Task Force on Community Education. New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, New Jersey, August 1978.

Stufflebeam, D.L., Foley, W.J., Gephart, W.J., Guba, E.G., Hammond, R.L., Merriman, H.O., and Provus, M.M., Educational Evaluation and Decision Making in Education. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1971.

Wood, G.S. and Santellanes, D.A., Evaluating A Community Education Program. Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan, 1973.

APPENDIX

Instruments

INTERVIEWER: _____

DATE: _____

This interview* is part of an evaluation we are conducting of the Lakewood Community Education program. There are two purposes for our efforts: (1) to find out what impact community education has had in Lakewood, and, (2) to field test a particular evaluation model with a community education program.

You were selected to be interviewed because of your contribution to and/or participation in the program. It is anticipated that this interview will take approximately half an hour. We appreciate your cooperation.

NAME: _____

AFFILIATION: _____

INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION:

- from when _____ to _____.
- how long (total years) _____

1. Describe involvement:

   How initiated?

   Nature of involvement?

2. In your opinion, what were the needs and/or interests of the community when you first became involved in the process?

3. In your opinion, have those needs and/or interests

   a) changed? (i.e., population shifts regarding age, race, SES group, sex).

   b) been to some degree met in an ongoing fashion through the community education process?

4. Is the program sensitive to changing needs and goals?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If so, how?

*Portions of these materials were excerpted from Evaluating A Community Education Program, by George S. Wood, Jr. and David A. Santellanes (Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan 48640, 1973).

Reprinted with permission.

NAME: _____

5. In your opinion, what needs are still unmet and why? Any documentation?

6. How do you believe these unmet needs can be addressed?

7. To the best of your knowledge, which community groups have been served?

8. How did the school become involved in the process? i.e., Were the teachers involved in planning? Was it voluntary? Etc.

9. How did the community become involved in the process? Was the community invited to participate? If so, how?

10. In your opinion, how can community involvement be expanded to reach all resident groups?

11. To the best of your knowledge, what facilities and resources support the community education process in Lakewood?

12. What is your general impression of the overall program?

13. What, in your opinion, is the range of activities and services provided?

Excellent_____ Good_____ Satisfactory_____

Poor _____ Inadequate_____

Please explain your choice.

NAME:_____

14. To the best of your knowledge, how have other agencies either supported or cooperated to enhance the community education process in Lakewood?

    - in the community? What agencies?

    - external to the community? What agencies?

15. How do you think we might increase interagency cooperation, should the need exist?

16. In your opinion, what other forces support the community education process?

17. In your opinion, what forces detract and/or inhibit the community education process?

18. In your opinion, what are the strengths of the program?

19. In your opinion, what are the weaknesses of the program?

20. In your opinion, how might the program be improved.

21. ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

NAME: _____

IMPRESSIONS OF THE LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM*

Please read each statement and circle the response which best represents your feelings.

	COMMUNITY RESIDENT	strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
A.	I understand the concept of community education.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
B.	I understand my role in community education.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
C.	I was involved in the development of goals and objectives for the optional program.**	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1.	I participate in activities offered by the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
2.	I feel more comfortable going to the school since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
3.	I have met the community school coordinator and feel comfortable talking with him/her.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
4.	My children participate in activities provided by the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
5.	My children enjoy school more since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
6.	There is better communication between the school and community as a result of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
7.	Some community problems are being addressed through optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
8.	Community residents are helping lead optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
9.	I have seen the community school coordinator working with residents in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
10.	Community residents assist in determining the activities offered in the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
11.	My impression of the school has improved as a result of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
12.	The types of optional program activities offered reflect the problems and needs of the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
13.	Adults, as well as children, are participating in the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
14.	The participation of local residents in the required program has increased since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
15.	The optional program tries not to duplicate services offered by other agencies in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
16.	The optional program has helped our community in ways other than programs.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
17.	The community school coordinator listens to suggestions from people in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
18.	I have made new friends in optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
19.	A list of optional program activities is provided for community residents.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
20.	The community is involved in planning special events offered in the school.	SA	A	UN	D	SD

*Portions of these materials were excerpted from Evaluating A Community Education Program, by George S. Wood, Jr. and David A. Santellanes (Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan 48640, 1973).

**The optional program refers to the courses, activities and programs offered by the Lakewood Community School Program.

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM

STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONS*

NAME:_____ PROGRAM AFFILIATION:_____
(optional)

DIRECTIONS: We are interested in your responses to the following questions. Please be candid.

1. If you had full authority to make changes in our present community school program and activities, what changes would you make?

2. What recommendations do you have to secure and develop more community involvement?

3. What strengths, in your judgment, are present in our current program operations?

4. What weaknesses, in your judgment, are present in our current program operations?

5. What strengths, in your judgment, are present in the performance of our program personnel?

6. What weaknesses, in your judgment, are present in the performance of our program personnel?

7. COMMENTS:

*Portions of these materials were excerpted from Evaluating A Community Education Program, by George S. Wood, Jr. and David A. Santellanes (Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan 48640, 1973).

NAME: _____

IMPRESSIONS OF THE LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM*

Please read each statement and circle the response which best represents your feelings.

STAFF PERSONNEL		strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
A.	I understand the concept of community education.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
B.	I understand my role in community education.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
C.	I was involved in the development of goals and objectives for the optional program.**	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1.	I participate in activities offered by the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
2.	I feel more comfortable going to the school since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
3.	I have met the community school coordinator and feel comfortable talking with him/her.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
4.	My children participate in activities provided by the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
5.	My children enjoy school more since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
6.	There is better communication between the school and community as a result of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
7.	Some community problems are being addressed through optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
8.	Community residents are helping lead optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
9.	I have seen the community school coordinator working with residents in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
10.	Community residents assist in determining the activities offered in the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
11.	My impression of the school has improved as a result of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
12.	The types of optional program activities offered reflect the problems and needs of the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
13.	Adults, as well as children, are participating in the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
14.	The participation of local residents in the required program has increased since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
15.	The optional program tries not to duplicate services offered by other agencies in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
16.	The optional program has helped our community in ways other than programs.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
17.	The community school coordinator listens to suggestions from people in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
18.	I have made new friends in optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
19.	A list of optional program activities is provided for community residents.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
20.	The community is involved in planning special events offered in the school.	SA	A	UN	D	SD

*Portions of these materials were excerpted from Evaluating A Community Education Program, by George S. Wood, Jr. and David A. Santellanes (Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan 48640, 1973).

**The optional program refers to the courses, activities and programs offered by the Lakewood Community School Program.

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE*

This questionnaire has been sent to a number of people who have participated in one or more courses and/or activities offered by the Lakewood Community School Program, as part of an effort to determine the impact of the program.

Please take a few minutes of your time to respond to the following questions. It would be greatly appreciated if you complete and return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope, no later than JANUARY 15, 1979.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. NAME:_____ PHONE:_____

   ADDRESS:_____
   City State Zip Code

2. OCCUPATION:_____

3. SEX: Male_____ Female_____

4. AGE: Under 20_____ 40-50_____
   20-30_____ 50-60_____
   30-40_____ Over 60_____

5. MARITAL STATUS: Single_____ Married_____

6. RESIDENCY: City_____ County_____ Other_____

7. How many years have you lived in your neighborhood:
   less than 3 years_____ from 7 to 10 years_____
   from 3 to 6 years_____ over 10 years _____

8. In what activities sponsored by the Lakewood Community School Program have you been involved? (Check all that apply)

Accredited College Program	_____	English High School Equivalency Program (GED)	_____
Accredited Evening High School	_____	Senior Citizen	_____
Adult Basic Education Program	_____	Spanish (GED)	_____
Adult Enrichment and Recreation	_____	Student Enrichment	_____
Daytime Adult Learning Center	_____	Summer Recreation Program	_____
OTHER:_____			

9. How long have you been participating in the Lakewood Community School Program(s)?
   less than 1 year_____ from 1-3 years_____ over 3 years_____

10. Overall, in approximately how many different courses or programs have you been involved?
    1 to 3 _____ 4 to 8 _____ more than 8_____

11. Overall, were you satisfied with the program?
    Yes_____ Yes, partially_____ No_____

12. How would you rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 5?
    (1 - Poor, 2 - Fair, 3 - Good, 4 - Very Good, 5 - Excellent)

location of course(s) or activity(ies)	_____
equipment and facilities	_____
competence of instructor	_____
overall supervision	_____
cost of program	_____

13. Do you plan to participate in future program courses and/or activities?
    Yes_____ No_____
    Please specify:_____

*Portions of these materials were excerpted from Evaluating A Community Education Program, by George S. Wood, Jr. and David A. Santellanes (Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan 48640, 1973).

NAME:_____

14. How did you find out about the program? (Check all that apply)

Newspaper	_____	My child	_____
Radio	_____	A neighbor	_____
Poster	_____	A friend	_____
Brochures	_____	Another agency	_____ (name)

Other:_____

15. Why did you enroll in the program?

16. Approximately how far do you live from the program you attended? (Check one)

1/2 mile	_____	2 miles	_____
1 mile	_____	3 or more miles	_____

17. What did you like best about the program?

18. What did you like least about the program?

19. If you had an opportunity to change or improve the program, what would you do?

20. Has your life been affected in any way by your participation in the program? (Example: GED enabled me to get a better job.)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

NAME: _____

General Impressions of the Lakewood Community Education Program

Please read each statement and circle the response which best represents your feeling.

	PROGRAM PARTICIPANT	strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
1.	I participate in activities offered by the optional program.*	SA	A	UN	D	SD
2.	I feel more comfortable going to the school since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
3.	I have met the community school coordinator and feel comfortable talking with him/her.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
4.	My children participate in activities provided by the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
5.	My children enjoy school more since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
6.	There is better communication between the school and community as a result of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
7.	Some community problems are being addressed through optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
8.	Community residents are helping lead optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
9.	I have seen the community school coordinator working with residents in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
10.	Community residents assist in determining the activities offered in the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
11.	My impression of the school has improved as a result of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
12.	The types of optional program activities offered reflect the problems and needs of the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
13.	Adults, as well as children, are participating in the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
14.	The participation of local residents in the required program has increased since the initiation of the optional program.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
15.	The optional program tries not to duplicate services offered offered by other agencies in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
16.	The optional program has helped our community in ways other than programs.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
17.	The community school coordinator listens to suggestions from people in the community.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
18.	I have made new friends in optional program activities.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
19.	A list of optional program activities is provided for community residents.	SA	A	UN	D	SD
20.	The community is involved in planning special events offered in the school.	SA	A	UN	D	SD

*The optional program refers to the courses, activities and programs offered by the Lakewood Community School Program.

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM

NEIGHBORHOOD AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE*

1. Are you aware of the community school (community education) program in this community?

   Yes_____ No_____

   ___ If answer is "yes" go on to Question 3 and complete the survey.
   ___ If answer is "no" go on to Question 2.

2. Are you aware of activities for students and adults, such as, Auto Mechanics, Karate, Speed Reading, Upholstering, Slimnastics and Breadmaking?

   ___ If answer is "yes" go on to Question 3 and complete survey.
   ___ If answer is still "no" give interviewee descriptive flyer.

3. How did you learn about the program? (Mark an X for each method interviewee responds to positively)

Newspaper articles and pictures	_____	A friend	_____
Newspaper paid advertising	_____	Posters	_____
Radio announcements	_____	Brochures	_____
My child	_____	Other	_____
A neighbor	_____	_____	

4. The community schools (community education) program is operated by:

5. Can you name one or more different types of programs offered by the community schools (community education) program?

6. Do you know why the community schools (community education) program is operating here?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, explain:_____

7. Does the program offer people in your neighborhood an opportunity to be a part of an advisory committee to help plan activities and future directions?

   Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

NOTE: If you wish to be put on the mailing list, fill in the following:

NAME:_____
ADDRESS:_____
_____

*Portions of these materials were excerpted from Evaluating A Community Education Program, by George S. Wood, Jr. and David A. Santellanes (Pendell Publishing Co., Midland, Michigan 48640, 1973).